



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/810,483	03/26/2004	Tetsuya Hamada	1324.70189	8133

7590 08/09/2006

Patrick G. Burns, Esq.
GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.
Suite 2500
300 South Wacker Drive
Chicago, IL 60606

EXAMINER

TON, MINH TOAN T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2871

DATE MAILED: 08/09/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/810,483	Applicant(s) HAMADA ET AL.	
	Examiner Toan Ton	Art Unit 2871	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 and 28-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 28-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Yano et al (US 6866393).

Yano discloses a reflection-type liquid crystal display device comprising: a light guide plate 1 having a polarizing element 24 stuck or adhered thereto on the side facing a reflection-type liquid crystal display panel and arranged maintaining a predetermined gap relative to the reflection-type liquid crystal display panel; a source of light 2 arranged on an end surface side of the light guide plate; a light-diffusing function imparted to the surface of the reflection-type liquid crystal display panel on the side facing the light guide plate.

Yano discloses the reflection-type liquid crystal display device according to claim 1, wherein the reflection-type liquid crystal display panel has a rough surface on the side facing the light guide plate (see at least Figures 1-2 and col. 9, third paragraph).

Yano discloses the reflection-type liquid crystal display device comprising a film 25 having a light-diffusing function is stuck to the surface of the reflection-type liquid crystal display panel on the side facing the light guide plate (see at least Figures 1-2).

Art Unit: 2871

3. Claims 28, 30 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Umemoto et al (US 6742921).

Umemoto discloses a reflection-type liquid crystal display device comprising (see at least Figure 5, 14): a light guide plate (e.g., 1, 101) having a polarizing element (e.g., 24, 124) stuck or adhered thereto on the side facing a reflection-type liquid crystal display panel and arranged maintaining a predetermined air gap relative to the reflection-type liquid crystal display panel; a source of light (e.g., 2, 102) arranged on an end surface side of the light guide plate; a light-diffusing function (e.g., 12, 112) imparted to the surface of the reflection-type liquid crystal display panel on the side facing the light guide plate.

Umemoto discloses the reflection-type liquid crystal display device comprising an (antireflection) film (e.g., 12, 112) having a light-diffusing function is stuck to the surface of the reflection-type liquid crystal display panel on the side facing the light guide plate (see at least Figure 5).

Umemoto discloses the reflection-type liquid crystal display device comprising a (antireflection) film (e.g., 12, 112) having a light-diffusing function on the side of the interface to the air gap.

Umemoto discloses the reflection-type liquid crystal display device comprising an (antireflection) film (e.g., 112) having a light-diffusing function with rough surface on the side facing the light guide plate.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2871

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 4-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yano as applied to claims 1-3 above.

Materials such as TAC (triacyl cellulose) used for the light diffusing film are common and known in the art for achieving advantages such as high transparency. Therefore, it would have been at least obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ materials such TAC for the light diffusing film for achieving advantages such as high transparency.

Yano discloses the light diffusing film equalizing the brightness by the prevention of uneven light (see at least col. 9, lines 18-20). Also, the light diffusing film comprising reflection-preventing characteristic(s) is common and known in the art (if needed, see conventional/prior art LCD device, as disclosed in Applicant's background of the invention).

6. Claim 31 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Umemoto as applied to claims 28-30 and 32 above.

Materials such as TAC (triacyl cellulose) used for the light diffusing film are common and known in the art for achieving advantages such as high transparency. Therefore, it would have been at least obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ materials such TAC for the light diffusing film for achieving advantages such as high transparency.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 05/26/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant contended that Yano fails to disclose a predetermined gap between the display panel and the light guide plate. However, Yano discloses the light guide plate (e.g., 1) separated from the display panel via at least an adhesive layer (e.g. 12), and thus there comprises at least a gap/distance between the display panel and the light guide plate. It is noted that the present claim 1 does not recite "air gap" similar to claim 28. Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Umemoto et al (US 6742921).

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2871

Contact Information

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Toan Ton whose telephone number is (571) 272-2303.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

July 28, 2006


TOANTON
PRIMARY EXAMINER